thavazhi system of partition would not meet the present day requirements. He strongly pleaded for individual partition.

Dewan's reply.—With regard to partition, at the time the Nair Bill was passing through the Legislative Council, the non-official Members unanimously objected to the provisions relating to partition and so the chapter on partition had to be omitted. Afterwards, Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai brought forward an amending Bill to introduce *thavazhi* partition. Government were not satisfied that the people really wanted it. For, when that Bill was before the Council, several people were informally consulted and the majority were against *thavazhi* partition. The difficulty is to know the real opinion among the majority. If, therefore, the majority of Nairs are of the deliberate opinion that partition is necessary and Government also are convinced of the need, there can be no difficulty in the way of taking legislative action.

33. Desirability of introducing a Bill into the Legislative Council to improve the present system of inheritance among Nanjanad Vellalas.

Mr. K. M. Thandavamurthia Pillai (Member, Tovala taluk) represented that, owing to the absence of a law defining the customs relating to marriage, succession, inheritance, and powers of management by the Karanavan, among the Nanjanad Vellalas, the community was labouring under serious disadvantages and difficulties. The Member explained the circumstances under which a Bill, once introduced into Council, was withdrawn with the object of introducing a more comprehensive one. Two years had elapsed since then and the revised Bill had not yet been introduced. The majority of suits in Nanjanad related to the rights of inheritance and *Ukanthudama*. The decisions of courts were often conflicting on those points and they were based on the analogy of the customs obtaining among other communities. The need for legislation on the subject was, therefore, imperative. The Member prayed that a new Bill, based on the suggestions contained in the memorials already submitted to Government by the members of the Vellala community, be introduced in the Legislative Council without further loss of time.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

34. Need for a legislative enactment to regulate inheritance and succession among Pulayas.

Mr. Kurumban Daivathan (Member, Nominated) submitted that, on account of the confusion existing among the Pulaya community as to the system of inheritance, considerable difficulties and disputes arose and, as a result, there was a good deal of litigation. The small property they enjoyed was thus ruined. The High Court had already declared Makkathayam as their form of inheritance. The Member requested that a law be passed on the basis of the High Court decision.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

35. Desirability of passing a Regulation reducing the rate of interest allowed on debts from 12 per cent to 7½ per cent.

Mr. P. Narayana Pillai (Member, Pattanapuram taluk) said that the rate of interest now allowed by civil courts on debts was 12 per cent. The poor agriculturists were unable to pay interest at that high rate. In the Agricultural Loans Regulation, the Government had reduced the rate of interest on loans granted to ryots to 4 per cent. It was not possible for Government to give loans to all people. He, therefore, requested that the rate of interest be reduced to 7½ per cent. and the same provided by a Regulation.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

36. Need for expunging portions of the Report of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee.

Mr. Trivikramar Vasudevar (Member, Jenmi, Padmanabhapuram Division) said that he had tried to impress upon Government the need for expunging certain objectionable portions in the Report of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee at the last

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

session and he had nothing more to add. The Government also appeared to be convinced of the reasonableness of the request. But no action had been so far taken in that direction. The matter was one which was a source of severe heart-burn to his community. Three years had elapsed since the report was published and yet their grievances remained unredressed. He, therefore, once again prayed that the objectionable portions in the report be expunged.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

37. Appointment of a Jenmi Member in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Devan Vasudevan Nambiatiri (Member, Jenmi, Kottayam Division) said that the Jenmies had a legitimate right to return a member to the Council on account of their large landed interests. Further, they would be unrepresented in the Council when the Jenmi Kudiyan Regulation Amendment Bill is taken up for consideration. The report was prejudicial to their interests already. If it was urged that their nominee should know English, they had a young graduate. He prayed that the long-standing prayer of the community be granted.

Mr. Narayanar Janardanar (Member, Jenmi, Trivandrum Division) said hat he agreed with the previous speaker and had nothing more to add.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

38. Appointment of a Mahomedan Member in the Legislative Council and a Mahomedan Judge in the High Court.

Mr. Gnaniar Sayyid Taha Sahib (Member, Nominated) said that the Mahomedans in the State numbered about 3 lakhs. In 75 per cent of the suits among them, religious questions arose for settlement. The questions mostly related to the appointment and removal of *Labbas* or to partition. Whenever there was a dispute among the Mahomedans, the first thing done was the closing of the mosques. All the religious principles concerning Mahomedanism were revealed through Mahomed, and so one versed in Koran alone would be able to settle the questions easily, and if there was a Mahomedan Judge in the High Court, such questions could be satisfactorily solved. The Member also urged the necessity for a Mahomedan member in the Legislative Council.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

39. Appointment of a member to represent the merchants of the State in the Legislative Council.

Mr. S. Ganapathi Pillai (Member, Trading Classes, Trivandrum) said that the subject-matter of his request had already been pressed on the attention of Government at the 9th session of the Assembly. In connection with the proposed expansion of the Council, the interests of the mercantile community should be considered in view of the largeness and importance of that community, and one membership allotted to merchants.

Dewan's reply.—The suggestion will be kept in view when the proposed Bill is passed into law, and rules are framed thereunder.

40. Need for giving the Cardamom land-holders a seat in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Sanyasi Mallayan Chetti (Member, Devicolam taluk) said that the need for nominating one of the cardamom ryots as a member of the Legislative Council had already been pressed before, both at the Assembly and through memorials. While each of the other divisions enjoyed the privilege of returning a member, the Devicolam Division alone remained unrepresented. The cardamom ryots were thus shut out from the benefits enjoyed by other people. He, therefore, requested that Government might be pleased to give the cardamom ryots the right to return a member to the Council.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly